



Qualification Verification Summary Report

NQ Verification 2018–19

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Drama
Verification event/visiting information	Postal/visiting verification
Date published:	June 2019

National Courses/Units verified:

H231 73	National 3	Drama Skills
H231 74	National 4	Drama Skills
H233 74	National 4	Drama: Performance — added value unit
H231 77	Advanced Higher	Drama Skills
H232 77	Advanced Higher	Drama: Production Skills

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

There is generally a clear understanding of the application of national standards and candidates are being given a range of creative opportunities to develop the required skills and perform well.

For centres delivering the National 3 Drama Skills unit, approaches to assessment were generally well laid out and structured to provide the necessary support for candidates at this level: clear step-by-step tasks relating to the required skill(s) for each assessment standard. Where this was not the case, the centre had presented candidates with an approach to assessment that was not specifically designed for this level. For example, presenting a National 3 candidate with a National 4 level assessment. This proved challenging for the candidate and also lead to over-assessment.

For the National 4 Drama Skills unit, the evidence submitted for verification mainly demonstrated approaches to assessment for assessment standards 1.1 and 1.2. Centres are using a diverse and creative range of stimuli for candidates

to respond to; candidates are supported well when selecting and developing their creative ideas.

For the National 4 Drama: Performance added value unit, visiting verification continues to be a positive experience and suggests that centres are approaching assessment with greater confidence.

Some centres continue to have both National 4 and National 5 candidates working alongside each other. For acting, where centres have presented National 4 candidates with an individual textual extract from which to develop their performance, this approach can often result in candidates not meeting the requirements for some assessment standards within the National 4 Drama Performance added value unit. It is essential that centres refer directly to the judging evidence table within the SQA unit assessment support pack for clarity in developing appropriate approaches to assessment.

For example, for assessment standard 1.1, there is an expectation that candidates base their ideas for drama on 'stimuli'. Often candidates are responding to a limited range of stimuli or in some cases a single stimulus. In addition, where candidates have developed a scripted extract alongside a National 5 candidate, this performance, in some cases, is not sustained for the required 10 minutes. Centres are reminded of the need to adapt this approach to assessment if candidates choose to devise their drama from a stimulus rather than develop script extracts from a text. There continues to be a need for centres to support candidates further in generating evidence of their awareness of social and cultural influences, form and structure.

Centres are presenting candidates with a range of approaches to assessment to meet assessment standard 1.2. Approaches that have been specifically designed and developed to support candidates in their responses to their chosen performance role continue to be most successful in generating the appropriate evidence to meet this assessment standard.

For assessment standard 1.3, where centres have completed this assessment, evidence continues to be predominantly recorded material. Most centres submitting digital evidence for this assessment standard had gathered good quality, clearly identifiable candidate evidence.

For assessment standard 1.4, 'Reflecting on their work and that of others', centres should ensure that the requirements of this assessment standard are fully met. The approach to assessment should support candidate responses while reflecting on strengths and areas for improvements. In addition, they should be given the opportunity to reflect on the contribution of two others within the production team.

For the Advanced Higher Drama Skills and Production Skills units, the evidence submitted for verification followed the combined approach. The approach to assessment was designed to allow for choice and flexibility. Candidates were given the opportunity to research and study their preferred theatre practitioner and generate the required evidence for assessment standards 1.1 and 1.2. The

tasks detailed in the approach to assessment related directly to the judging evidence table in the SQA unit assessment support pack and encouraged candidates to generate evidence to demonstrate the required skills, at times independently, appropriate for this level.

Assessment judgements

Event, postal and visiting verification requires the centre to make clear assessment judgements to accompany candidates' evidence, allowing the verifier to reach an informed decision that the centre is making reliable, consistent and valid assessment judgements which are in line with national standards.

For most centres, there is evidence of reliable, consistent and valid judgements being applied to candidate evidence. In cases where the approach to assessment was specifically designed to meet the requirements of an assessment standard, the centre assessor was able to confidently and correctly judge the candidate evidence by referring to the judging evidence table in the SQA unit assessment support pack. Where an assessment judgement was identified as being lenient or severe, this was, in most cases, due to the approach to assessment not supporting candidates in meeting the requirements of an assessment standard at the appropriate level.

03

Section 3: General comments

In general, centre assessors have a clear understanding of the standards for National 3, 4 and Advanced Higher Drama.

Overall, centres submitted evidence which clearly captured candidates' meeting the requirements of all levels verified. For visiting verification, centres were well prepared for the visit and keen to ensure they had sufficient evidence for all assessment standards being verified. Positive feedback was received about this model of visiting verification, allowing one-to-one dialogue between the visiting verifier and internal assessors. Centre staff showed a keenness to engage in professional dialogue and took the opportunity to have their questions or concerns discussed.

For the National 4 Drama: Performance added value unit, the approach to assessment using annotated scenarios/scripts should be appropriate for all candidates at National 4 level and consideration should be given to all production roles being developed and assessed.

In addition, all evidence submitted should be attributable to the assessment standard to which it relates. Centres are reminded to label candidate evidence appropriately by indicating the related assessment standard on it.

There was clear evidence of centres engaging with and applying effective internal quality assurance processes. Some centres are using local authority level documentation, filtering this for use within their own centre and further applying this within their subject-specific faculty or department. Where centres had a

rigorous system in place, this impacted positively on both the development of approaches to assessment and the consistency of assessment judgements.

There was evidence of some centres using the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit to support their internal quality assurance processes. This can be found at www.sqa.org.uk/IVToolkit.

Where a centre failed to provide evidence of internal verification, it was not possible to provide comment on its effectiveness. Centre staff are reminded that all centres offering SQA qualifications must have an effective internal quality-assurance system in place which ensures that all candidates are assessed accurately, fairly and consistently to national standards.